

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/814,432		03/30/2004	John T. Forbis	T76611	T76611 5728	
20449	7590	03/25/2005		EXAMINER		
KARL R	CANNON	ſ	BRYANT, DAVID P			
PO BOX 1	909					
SANDY, UT 84091				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				3726		
				DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			W/			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	~/~			
	10/814,432	FORBIS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	David P. Bryant	3726				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) do vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Ja	nuary 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 25-37 and 53-63 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-37 and 53-57 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 58-63 are subject to restriction and/or 	re withdrawn from consideratior	l.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been receiv ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail (5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II (claims 58-63) in the reply filed on January 3, 2005, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that (1) the groups of invention are similar enough to merit examination in the same application, and (2) examination of all claims will not pose an undue burden upon the examiner. This is not found persuasive because of the following:

- (1) The two groups of invention have been shown to be distinct, thus justifying the requirement for restriction. Applicant even points out the distinctness of the inventions in the response, stating that claims 25-37 and 53-63 are "different in scope" but should be examined together regardless.
- (2) One way to show undue burden on the examiner is a showing of different classification of subject matter (MPEP §808.02). The different classifications were clearly set forth in the requirement for restriction, and the search required for Group I is not the same search required for Group II.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 25-37 and 53-57 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

A further restriction is required between one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C.

Art Unit: 3726

 Claim 58, drawn to a method of assembling a plurality of fences, classified in class 29, subclass 897.32.

II. Claims 59-63, drawn to a method of assembling a fence, classified in class 29, subclass 525.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because it does not require the claimed cap members or spacers. The subcombination has separate utility such as for assembling a fence of one particular construction.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application also contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species A: The embodiment depicted in Figure 13 (readable on claim 60).

<u>Species B:</u> The embodiment depicted in Figure 5 (readable on claim 61).

Species C: The embodiment depicted in Figures 8-10 (readable on claims 59, 62, and 63).



Application/Control Number: 10/814,432

Art Unit: 3726

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Karl Cannon on March 18, 2005, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 3726

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David P. Bryant whose telephone number is (571) 272-4526. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David P. Bryant Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3726

dpb 3/21/05



Page 5